

The Rufford Foundation

Final Report

Congratulations on the completion of your project that was supported by The Rufford Foundation.

We ask all grant recipients to complete a Final Report Form that helps us to gauge the success of our grant giving. The Final Report must be sent in **word format** and not PDF format or any other format. We understand that projects often do not follow the predicted course but knowledge of your experiences is valuable to us and others who may be undertaking similar work. Please be as honest as you can in answering the questions – remember that negative experiences are just as valuable as positive ones if they help others to learn from them.

Please complete the form in English and be as clear and concise as you can. Please note that the information may be edited for clarity. We will ask for further information if required. If you have any other materials produced by the project, particularly a few relevant photographs, please send these to us separately.

Please submit your final report to jane@rufford.org.

Thank you for your help.

Josh Cole, Grants Director

Grant Recipient Details	
Your name	Chi Thi Bao Phan
Project title	Participatory Wetland Conservation in Yok Don National Park, Vietnam
RSG reference	13649-1
Reporting period	
Amount of grant	£5988
Your email address	c.phan@uq.edu.au
Date of this report	08 June 2015

1. Please indicate the level of achievement of the project’s original objectives and include any relevant comments on factors affecting this.

Objective	Not achieved	Partially achieved	Fully achieved	Comments
Testing the feasibility and effectiveness of implementing an adaptive co-management strategy for managing protected areas at a local level		Yes		The willingness and capacity of government to implement true co-management has been an issue and the testing of how co-management might work was limited.
Examining the effectiveness of social-ecological models in increasing understanding and expanding opportunities for collaboration amongst stakeholders			Yes	The modelling process has improved the understanding of both park managers and local people. While park managers reported they now better understood the needs of local people and how keystone species played in local culture, local people said that they understood the roles of park managers in conservation and why they needed to conserve keystone species.

2. Please explain any unforeseen difficulties that arose during the project and how these were tackled (if relevant).

The obstacles I had to overcome working at Yok Don National Park were the changing of park directors and scheduling working with local people. The director of Yok Don National Park changed once between my first and second fieldtrip. I had to do all the paperwork again and describe the project to the new director to have the permissions to work with the park managers and local people. Working with local people was more complicated than I first anticipated as most people work from 7AM to 5PM and were not willing to meet with me during the day despite being well compensated for their time. Therefore I had to interview and undertake discussion with them during evenings at some villages which extended the amount of time it took to complete these interviews.

3. Briefly describe the three most important outcomes of your project.

The three most important outcomes of this project are:

- A conceptual social-ecological model for Yok Don National Park was developed between the representatives of park managers and local people. During the modelling workshop, park managers reported attaining a better understanding of the resource needs of indigenous people, the role of cultural keystone species in local livelihoods and the role of park management could play in improving local livelihoods. One of two managers said he learnt that land for cultivation was local people’s most important need as cultivation is their main source of food and income. The other said he better understood traditional knowledge, including the behaviour of the most important cultural keystone species and the roles they play in local people’s lives, and he now understands the need for co-management of the

park. All participants from the communities reported an increased awareness of the importance of wetland resources and the need to maintain these as well as a better understanding of the functions of important species in terms of their conservation.

- After the workshop managers reported their understanding of local people's desires to be ensuring local livelihoods through investment in cultivation, planting perennial plants and breeding some species around their villages. They saw the roles that park management could play to improve local livelihoods and reduce conflict with conservation included employing local people as guides and providing permission, funding, training and source animals for local people to rear and breed animals rather than taking them directly from the forest. Before the workshop, 81% of local people reported that they did not communicate with managers about daily life or tell the managers about their needs. After the workshop, all representatives from the local community felt more comfortable initiating discussion with park managers compared with their reluctance to share their knowledge before. On a scale from 1 (not comfortable) to 7 (very comfortable), 60% of participants ranked their level of comfort as 7 and the remaining ranked it between 4 and 6. This suggests that the model development process is likely to result in increased communication between managers and local people and reduce conflict.
- The mapping of the current institutional, governance and management structures of the park and how these were perceived to change during the workshops and modelling process. Documenting these changes was essential for tracking the effectiveness of the modelling process.

4. Briefly describe the involvement of local communities and how they have benefitted from the project (if relevant).

The local communities were involved every step of this project including individual interviews, focus group discussions, management effectiveness evaluation workshop and modelling workshop. Local communities now have a better understanding about the species that play a key role for them culturally and the reasons why they need to conserve the wetland habitat. They also have gained a better understanding of the roles and responsibilities of park managers in protecting the park. The outcomes from the modelling process have suggested some potential strategies to improve local community livelihoods. It also showed that the need for open dialogue between managers and local communities as a pathway to better communication and empowerment of local people.

5. Are there any plans to continue this work?

A workshop for result dissemination between park managers and local communities will be held in February 2016. During this workshop, the opinions of park managers and local communities about the plans for continuing this work will be discussed.

6. How do you plan to share the results of your work with others?

I intend to share the results of this project with others through

- An oral presentation at the 21st International Symposium on Society and Resource Management Conference 2015 in Charleston, South Carolina from 13th to 15th June, 2015.
- Three scientific papers which will be submitted to social and environmental management journals. These papers are currently being written and revised and will be submitted in 2015.

- A final workshop between the representatives of park managers and local communities will be held at Yok Don National Park in December 2015 to share the results.

7. Timescale: Over what period was The Rufford Foundation grant used? How does this compare to the anticipated or actual length of the project?

The Rufford Foundation Grant was used in 17 months. This is longer than the anticipated length as I had to overcome the obstacles outlined above.

8. Budget: Please provide a breakdown of budgeted versus actual expenditure and the reasons for any differences. All figures should be in £ sterling, indicating the local exchange rate used.

Item	Budgeted Amount	Actual Amount	Difference	Comments
Airfares from Australia to Vietnam	1688	1817	-129	Different season had different price
Local flights	169	349	-180	There were long holidays during the fieldtrips; therefore there were four local flights instead of two as proposed
Local transport	376	503	-127	
Field accommodation and food	1256	1304	-48	
Payments for local interview and workshop participants	1808	2078	-270	
Field expenses (maps, books, stationery)	185	169	16	
Workshop preparation (printing, binding, venue hire and projector hire)	201	153	48	
Workshop for result dissemination	305	0	305	The workshop will be held after the PhD thesis submission, around February 2016
Total	5988	6373	-385	

9. Looking ahead, what do you feel are the important next steps?

The modelling process has suggested some potential breeding programmes for livelihoods improvement based on the discussion between park managers and local community. This work can continue by implementing the breeding trials to evaluate this. Local people identified a six step plan to instigate a breeding programme. Firstly, the permission for breeding must be approved by local Government and park managers before implementing. Finding potential funding is the next step. Representatives to trial each breeding programme would then be carefully chosen. The representatives learn the methods and the breeding process from other successful models. After understanding the process, young individuals for rearing and breeding would be provided. Finally,

the produce would be advertised to expand to the market. If the model is successful, it will then be introduced and applied to other households in that village.

10. Did you use The Rufford Foundation logo in any materials produced in relation to this project? Did the RSGF receive any publicity during the course of your work?

The Rufford Foundation logo will be included in the acknowledgements for my oral presentation at the 21st International Symposium on Society and Resource Management Conference 2015.

11. Any other comments?

The fieldwork including all data collection for this project is completed and this data is analysed. Drafts of all three papers have been produced and they are currently in the revision stage.